UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,752	01/27/2004	Zenya Nagashima	075834.00450	1915
33448 ROBERT J. DE	7590 . 06/12/2007	EXAMINER		
LEWIS T. STEADMAN ROCKEY, DEPKE, LYONS AND KITZINGER, LLC SUITE 5450 SEARS TOWER			PENG, CHARLIE YU	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	CHICAGO, IL 60606-6306			
*			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

, •••		74				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/765,752	NAGASHIMA, ZENYA				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Charlie Peng	2883				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cf after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sany reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rn. a reply within the statutory minimum of third eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	·					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 October 2006</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
•						
closed in accordance with the practice und	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 12-28 is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 12-28 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	ndrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 October 2005</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the country. The oath or declaration is objected to by the	dare: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ o the drawing(s) be held in abeyar prection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1 ☒ Certified copies of the priority docur 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docur 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date	·	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2883

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 23 March 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 12-19 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made. Please refer to 35 USC 103(a) below for details.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There lacks proper support in the original disclosure for negative limitations claiming there is no light-blocking or opaque material between the light emitting element and the photoreceptor element. In fact, the drawings (Fig. 3 in particular) appear to teach otherwise as a submount 6 is located between the two elements, and the original disclosure does not specify the submount to be made of transparent, translucent or non-opaque material. (See MPEP 2173.05(i))

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2883

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent 6,205,274 to Zhou in view of U.S. Patent 4,540,237 to Winzer, and claim 28 is rejected over Zhou. Zhou teaches an optical device having an optical fiber 101 having an inclined end face at one end, wherein the end face is has a reflective coating 105,

a light source **102** located radially from the center of the optical fiber **101** to emit light and faces the reflective coating **105**,

a light detector 118 places along an optical axis of the optical fiber 101 and adjacent to the one end of the optical fiber 101. (See at least Fig. 7A and description) Zhou is silent on how light diffuses from the light source 102, but it is clear, particularly in the embodiment cited here (illustrated by Fig. 7), "most of the light from light source 102 is reflected into fiber 101 and transmitted to a remote receiver. Some (rest) of the light, however, is transmitted through the coating 105 and medium 104 to a power monitor 103" acting as part of a feedback control loop for the light source 102. The light detector 118 receives optical signals not deflected by the coating 105 from a remote optical transmitter. That is, light emitted by the light source 102 does not reach the light detector 118 in this embodiment, as the light detector 118 is only designed to receive optical signals from the remote transmitter along the optical fiber 101, while signals

Art Unit: 2883

emitted by the light source 102 is either reflected to the optical fiber 101 by the coating 105 or redirected to the power monitor 103. Since the light detector 118 needs to be placed outside the maximum transmission range of the light source 102 for this invention to function properly and as designed, it would have been immediately obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to ensure so in order to prevent cross-talking.

Zhou is silent on the end face of the optical fiber having a non-angled portion.

Winzer teaches a coupling component comprising

a first fiber $\mathbf{f_s}$ having an angled surface $\mathbf{A_a}$ coated with a reflective layer \mathbf{R} and a non-angled surface $\mathbf{A_e}$,

a second fiber \mathbf{f}_{e} sharing and communicate through the non-angled surface \mathbf{A}_{e} with the first fiber,

a third fiber $\mathbf{f_a}$ serving as an out-coupling fiber for coupling light out of the first optical fiber $\mathbf{f_s}$.

Since both the Zhou reference and the Winzer reference are of analogous art placing optical elements outside to light transmission path of the optical fibers and communicating with the optical fibers via a angled and reflective end surface, the purpose of using the teaching of the Winzer reference would be recognized as relevant prior art to Zhou's invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to built a housing, preferably opaque, as suggested by the usage of the multi-end-faced fiber by Winzer. The motivation would be to reduces or eliminate interference by light signal coming directly from the source, as the detector would only receive light signal from the optical fiber as intended.

Art Unit: 2883

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the advantage of having a nonangled portion of the end surface as it permits the fiber to abut and align a flat surface more readily and easily.

The prism 104 is a light-redirecting optical element, and is neither opaque nor light-blocking.

With reference to claims 13 and 17, core diameter of the fiber f_s is d_s , and core area is indicated as that inside the dashed line.

With reference to claims 14 and 18, Zhou teaches that the detector 118 can also be placed so that a normal line to its light receiving plane is perpendicular to an optical axis of the optical fiber 101 and the light source 102 is facing the inclined end face.

With reference to claims 15 and 19, only the angled surface A_a is coated with the reflective film R.

With specific reference to claims 24 and 25, though Winzer uses the third fiber f_a , Zhou has already taught optical fibers are not needed for light transmission between the angled surface and various optical elements surrounding the prism 104 for the sake of minimizing the fiber optic header. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to simply eliminate an unnecessary component, since it has been held that omission of an element and thereby eliminating its function is an obvious expedient that involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Kuhle*, 188 USPQ 7.

With specific reference to claims 26 and 27, Zhou as modified by Winzer has its core substantially bisected by the angled portion at the surface A_a .

Art Unit: 2883

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charlie Peng whose telephone number is (571) 272-2177. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 am - 6 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Font can be reached on (571) 272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

I Charlie Peng I
Charlie Peng
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800